# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 09/650,173 | 08/29/2000 | Nicholas J. Lee | AMAZON.059A | 8624 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 20995    7590    09/17/2007 | EXAMINER | |
| KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP | OPSASNICK, MICHAEL N | |
| 2040 MAIN STREET | | |
| FOURTEENTH FLOOR | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| IRVINE, CA 92614 | 2626 | |

| NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|
| 09/17/2007 | ELECTRONIC |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jcartee@kmob.com
eOAPilot@kmob.com

# UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
## U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

| APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 09650173 | 8/29/00 | LEE, NICHOLAS J. | AMAZON.059A |

KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP
2040 MAIN STREET
FOURTEENTH FLOOR
IRVINE, CA 92614

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| Michael N.. Opsasnick |

| ART UNIT | PAPER |
|---|---|
| 2626 | 20070715 |

DATE MAILED:

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner for Patents**

See attached revised Examiner's Answer (to correct the patent number to the already presented Weber reference) and consideration of IDS's.

/M M Gmil/
M.Opsasnick
Primary Examiner
AU2626
9/04/07

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

# MAILED

## SEP 1 7 2007

## Technology Center 2600

# BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
# AND INTERFERENCES

Application Number: 09/650,173
Filing Date: August 29, 2000
Appellant(s): LEE, NICHOLAS J.

Mr. Ronald J. Schoenbaum
<u>For Appellant</u>

## EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed June 29, 2006, appealing from the Office action

mailed February 23, 2006.

**(1) Real Party in Interest**

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) Related Appeals and Interferences**

The following are the related appeals, interferences, and judicial proceedings known to the

examiner which may be related to, directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on

the Board's decision in the pending appeal:  Appeal Brief in the current application, filed

9/10/2004; and Appeal Brief in the current application, filed 5/24/2004.

**(3) Status of Claims**

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) Status of Amendments After Final**

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in

the brief is correct.

**(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

**(7) Claims Appendix**

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(8) Evidence Relied Upon**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 6,377,927 | LOGHMANI | 4-2002 |
| 5,917,889 | BROTMAN et al | 6-1999 |

6,434,524                    WEBER                    8-2002

**(9) Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the

combination of Loghmani et al (6377927) in view of Brotman et al (5917889) in further view of

Weber (6434524).

As per claims 1, 14, Loghmani et al (6377927) teaches prompting a user to enter a

voice query for searching a domain of items (as use inputting a query to shop for books –

col. 9 line 58 – col. 10 line 10), wherein the input is voice input (fig. 10, via telephone,

and thru voice query – col. 10 line 10), and the results are presented back to the user, via

voice (col. 10 lines 25-29). The voice recognition uses a voice optimized database to

interpret the user's input (col. 4 lines 38-55; fig. 6).

Loghmani et al (6377927) does not explicitly teach prompting the user to submit

a set of characters with respect to the original input, however, Brotman et al (5917889)

teaches a processing environment wherein the system prompts a user for character input

(col. 1 lines 40-55), narrowing down the domain based on the character input (Fig. 2,

subblock 630); creating a dynamic grammar based upon the character input (Fig. 2,

subblock 630), and prompting the user to input the voice version of the character input

(Fig. 2, subblocks 640-690). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art of speech recognition to add to the speech recognition process of

Loghmani et al (6377927) a prompt for the user to specify characters and to verify the

input because it would advantageously reduce the domain field of choices, as well as

improving the accuracy process in using the dual character input and followup speech

verification (Brotman et al (5917889), col. 1 lines 40-45, referring back to col. 1 lines 10-

26).

        To summarize, the combination of Loghmani et al (6377927) in view of Brotman

et al (5917889) teaches a system performing a voice query to search a domain of items,

returning a domain of results based on the voice query, prompting the user to enter

characters, the system generating a further limited domain, the system prompting an

utterance indicative of the characters, and the system inquiring if the generated string is

the intended string.

        The combination of Loghmani et al (6377927) in view of Brotman et al

(5917889) does not explicitly teach updating the dynamic grammar to reflect valid

utterances, however, Weber (6434524) teaches the updating of dynamic grammar based

upon successful utterance matches (Weber (6434524), , col. 13 lines 13-23). Therefore, it

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of speech recognition

technologies to modify the teachings of Loghmani et al (6377927) in view of Brotman et

al (5917889) with updating the dynamic grammar for the user because it would

advantageously deal with the voice idiosyncrasies of individual users (Weber (6434524),

col. 13 lines 23-24).


As per claim 2, using the combination of Loghmani et al (6377927) in view of

Brotman et al (5917889) in further view of Weber (6434524), Brotman et al (5917889)

teaches "prompting a user......query term" as N character submission (col. 4 lines 36-41)


As per claims 3-6, using the combination of Loghmani et al (6377927) in view of

Brotman et al (5917889) in further view of Weber (6434524), Weber (6434524) teaches

using subcategories labeled as "author" (Weber, col. 6 lines 56-63), as well as Loghmani

et al (6377927) (col. 10, line 1)


As per claim 7, using the combination of Loghmani et al (6377927) in view of

Brotman et al (5917889) in further view of Weber (6434524), Brotman et al (5917889)

teaches user selected keypad entry (col. 4 lines 36-41)


As per claim 8, using the combination of Loghmani et al (6377927) in view of

Brotman et al (5917889) in further view of Weber (6434524), Brotman et al (5917889)

teaches "user uttering the characters and using the keypad entries of the......character" as

using utterances to match (col. 4 lines 15-35).

As per claim 9, using the combination of <u>Loghmani et al (6377927)</u> in view of <u>Brotman et al (5917889)</u> in further view of <u>Weber (6434524)</u>, <u>Brotman et al (5917889)</u> teaches dynamic grammar usage (col. 4 lines 47-52)

As per claim 10, using the combination of <u>Loghmani et al (6377927)</u> in view of <u>Brotman et al (5917889)</u> in further view of <u>Weber (6434524)</u>, <u>Brotman et al (5917889)</u> teaches extracting text from a subset of items derived from a database (col. 5 lines 25-30)

As per claim 11, using the combination of <u>Loghmani et al (6377927)</u> in view of <u>Brotman et al (5917889)</u> in further view of <u>Weber (6434524)</u>, <u>Brotman et al (5917889)</u> teaches storage of the subset (col. 5 lines 18-24)

As per claim 12, using the combination of <u>Loghmani et al (6377927)</u> in view of <u>Brotman et al (5917889)</u> in further view of <u>Weber (6434524)</u>, <u>Brotman et al (5917889)</u> teaches a fixed number of input characters (col. 5 lines 25-30)

As per claim 13, using the combination of <u>Loghmani et al (6377927)</u> in view of <u>Brotman et al (5917889)</u> in further view of <u>Weber (6434524)</u>, <u>Brotman et al (5917889)</u> teaches determination of a threshold number of characters (col. 5 lines 25-30).

Claims 15-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the

combination of Loghmani et al (6377927) in view of Brotman et al (5917889) in  further view of

Weber (6434524).

As per claims 15,16,24-26,33,35,36,40-43,48-51,54,55 Loghmani et al (6377927)

teaches prompting a user to enter a voice query for searching a domain of items (as use

inputting a query to shop for books –col. 9 line 58 – col. 10 line 10), wherein the input is

voice input (fig. 10, via telephone, and thru voice query – col. 10 line 10), and the results

are presented back to the user, via voice (col. 10 lines 25-29).   The voice recognition

uses a voice optimized database to interpret the user's input (col. 4 lines 38-55; fig. 6).

Loghmani et al (6377927) does not explicitly teach prompting the user to submit

a set of characters with respect to the original input, however, Brotman et al (5917889)

teaches a processing environment wherein the system prompts a user for character input

(col. 1 lines 40-55), narrowing down the domain based on the character input (Fig. 2,

subblock 630); creating a dynamic grammar based upon the character input (Fig. 2,

subblock 630), and prompting the user to input the voice version of the character input

(Fig. 2, subblocks 640-690).  Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art of speech recognition to add to the speech recognition process of

Loghmani et al (6377927) a prompt for the user to specify characters and to verify the

input because it would advantageously reduce the domain field of choices, as well as

improving the accuracy process in using the dual character input and followup speech

verification (<u>Brotman et al (5917889)</u>, col. 1 lines 40-45, referring back to col. 1 lines 10-26).

To summarize, the combination of <u>Loghmani et al (6377927)</u> in view of <u>Brotman et al (5917889)</u> teaches a system performing a voice query to search a domain of items, returning a domain of results based on the voice query, prompting the user to enter characters, the system generating a further limited domain, the system prompting an utterance indicative of the characters, and the system inquiring if the generated string is the intended string.

The combination of <u>Loghmani et al (6377927)</u> in view of <u>Brotman et al (5917889)</u> does not explicitly teach updating the dynamic grammar to reflect valid utterances, however, <u>Weber (6434524)</u> teaches the updating of dynamic grammar based upon successful utterance matches (<u>Weber (6434524)</u>, , col. 13 lines 13-23). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of speech recognition technologies to modify the teachings of <u>Loghmani et al (6377927)</u> in view of <u>Brotman et al (5917889)</u> with updating the dynamic grammar for the user because it would advantageously deal with the voice idiosyncrasies of individual users (<u>Weber (6434524)</u>, col. 13 lines 23-24).

As per claims 17-19,20,27, using the combination of <u>Loghmani et al (6377927)</u> in view of <u>Brotman et al (5917889)</u> in further view of <u>Weber (6434524)</u>, <u>Weber (6434524)</u> teaches using subcategories labeled as "author" (Weber, col. 6 lines 56-63), as well as <u>Loghmani et al (6377927)</u> (col. 10, line 1).

As per claims 20,29,44,45, using the combination of Loghmani et al (6377927) in view of Brotman et al (5917889) in further view of Weber (6434524), Brotman et al (5917889) teaches "prompting a user......query term" as N character submission (col. 4 lines 36-41)

As per claims 21,22, and 32,46, using the combination of Loghmani et al (6377927) in view of Brotman et al (5917889) in further view of Weber (6434524), Brotman et al (5917889) teaches user selected keypad entry (col. 4 lines 36-41)

As per claims 23,37, using the combination of Loghmani et al (6377927) in view of Brotman et al (5917889) in further view of Weber (6434524), Brotman et al (5917889) teaches determination of a threshold number of characters (col. 5 lines 25-30).

As per claims 28,38, using the combination of Loghmani et al (6377927) in view of Brotman et al (5917889) in further view of Weber (6434524), Brotman et al (5917889) teaches storage of the subset (col. 5 lines 18-24)

As per claim 30, using the combination of Loghmani et al (6377927) in view of Brotman et al (5917889) in further view of Weber (6434524), Weber (6434524) teaches using subcategories labeled as "author" (Weber, col. 6 lines 56-63), as well as Loghmani et al (6377927) (col. 10, line 1).

As per claim 31, using the combination of <u>Loghmani et al (6377927)</u> in view of <u>Brotman et al (5917889)</u> in further view of <u>Weber (6434524)</u>, <u>Brotman et al (5917889)</u> teaches a fixed number of input characters (col. 5 lines 25-30)

As per claim 33, the combination of <u>Loghmani et al (6377927)</u> in view of <u>Brotman et al (5917889)</u> in further view of <u>Weber (6434524)</u> teaches the first query as the voice query, and then a second query as the character input/voice verification input, as discussed above.

As per claims 34,47, using the combination of <u>Loghmani et al (6377927)</u> in view of <u>Brotman et al (5917889)</u> in further view of <u>Weber (6434524)</u>, <u>Brotman et al (5917889)</u> teaches dynamic grammar usage (col. 4 lines 47-52)

As per claims 39,51,54, using the combination of <u>Loghmani et al (6377927)</u> in view of <u>Brotman et al (5917889)</u> in further view of <u>Weber (6434524)</u>, <u>Brotman et al (5917889)</u> teaches extracting text from a subset of items derived from a database (col. 5 lines 25-30)

As per claims 46,52, using the combination of <u>Loghmani et al (6377927)</u> in view of <u>Brotman et al (5917889)</u> in further view of <u>Weber (6434524)</u>, <u>Brotman et al (5917889)</u> teaches "user uttering the characters and using the keypad entries of the......character" as using utterances to match (col. 4 lines 15-35).

### (10) Response to Argument

Before addressing the appellants arguments with respect to the specific claim rejections,

examiner will address appellants synopsis of the prior art found on pages 8 to 10 of the appeal

brief.

Rebuttal to appellants synopsis of the prior art:

As to the comment that in Loghmani, "the spoken search query is processed

without using a voice recognition grammar to initially convert the search query to text",

examiner disagrees and notes in Loghmani teaching conversion of input speech queries

into text (abstract), as well as using a voice recognition database to recognize input voice

to generate text (col. 6 lines 20-30).

As to the comment that the Brotman reference "is not directed to the capture of

search queries", examiner is not clear as to the relationship between "capture of search

queries" and the current claim scope of the independent claims. In response to applicant's

argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is

noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., capture of search queries) are not

recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the

specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re

Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). As to the comment that

"Brotman's method were used to capture search queries, it would not provide an efficient

process for doing so", examiner notes that the introduction of the Brotman reference is to

include character recognition via telephone keypad, and that it is the combination of the

Loghmani reference with the Brotman reference that improves the accuracy of the

recognition process.  Lastly, as a tradeoff, the combination of Loghmani in view of

Brotman, would increase the accuracy of the recognition process, although requiring

further user input.

As to the comment regarding the Weber reference,  i.e., "In contrast to the

methods disclosed in the present application, Weber's method of using context-specific

voice recognition grammars is not well suited for searching large domains of items",

examiner again notes that although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification,

limitations from the specification are not read into the claims.  See *In re Van Geuns*, 988

F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).


Returning to the arguments presented by the Appellant against the prior art rejection, On

pages 11-12 of the appeal brief, the appellant presents arguments against the rejection of claim 1,

and argues that the Brotman reference does not limit the choice of characters (and generating a

dynamic grammar based on the subset).  Referring to Brotman, col. 4 lines 36-41, and block 630

of Fig. 2, the user is allowed to select keypad numbers to represent letters of the alphabet, which

creates a sub-grammar corresponding to the digits entered.  For instance, if the user depresses the

keys "4", "7","2", a grammar would be created that defines the allowable characters as

{G,H,I},{P,R,S}, and {A,B,C}.  Examiner argues that the grammar created is not only a subset

of the original domain of characters (the original domain is any combination of A-Z, whereas

based upon the example of keys "4","7","2" above, generates a subgrammar of {G,H,I},

{P,R,S}, and {A,B,C}), but also, in Brotman, the user is not required to enter the whole character

set (e.g., when the user specifies a certain number sequence, but makes an error, the user can

pause – and hence not enter the full sequence – col. 4 lines 20-28), and furthermore, Brotman

teaches subset processing as shown in col. 6 lines 15-67 → summarizing, based upon a user's

input of "AD345M" (with corresponding telephone keys 2,3,4,5,6), a grammar is generated by

processing the subset of "345" and the possible meanings of the telephone keypad numbers 2&6

(col. 6 line 53 to col. 7 line 17). In summary, Brotman teaches subset processing, as evidenced

by the two examples shown above, at different stages of character/speech conversion. As per

applicants arguments, starting on page 12 of the appeal brief, against the motivation to combine

the Loghmani and Brotman references, examiner disagrees and argues that Loghmani is

concerned with speech recognition accuracy for speech queries (Col. 1 lines 13-17), and is

especially concerned with speech recognition accuracy in a commercial transaction based system

(col. 10 lines 8-36). An artisan of ordinary skill would easily recognize that sub-par recognition

performance would adversely effect return customers in the system as taught by Loghmani. As

per the argument that "one skilled in the art would not be motivated to design a system that

requires users to undergo such an unnecessary burdensome process", examiner disagrees and

notes that motivation in the disclosure of Brotman directly dispels this allegation by the

appellant, wherein Brotman explicitly uses both techniques to verify a user query (col. 1 lines

40-51). As per the argument that neither processes by Brotman and Loghmani "suffers from

voice recognition accuracy problems or speech problems, examiner argues that if this statement

was true, then Loghmani would not recommend substitution/modification to their system (col. 10

lines 8-17, col. 10 lines 49-51 – suggesting the use of three different types of voice databases –

one using AVV, one using non-voice enabled database, and a voice optimized databases –

clearly, the intention of Loghmani is to use varying types of voice processes to ensure accuracy;

and as such, Brotman being a voice processing technique that improves accuracy of recognition).

Clearly, motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the Loghmani and Brotman

references are found in both references. As per the arguments against the use of the Weber

reference, examiner argues that the purpose of the Weber reference is to teach the updating of

dynamic grammar based upon successful utterance matches (col. 13 lines 13-23), and that the

motivation to combine Weber with the combination of Loghmani in view of Brotman is to create

a modified system that could deal with the voice idiosyncrasies of individual users (Weber

(6434524), col. 13 lines 23-24).


Continuing with arguments against claims 2,9,15,26,29,31,39, please see the rebuttal

presented above with respect to "subset". Furthermore, Brotman et al (5917889) teaches

"prompting a user......query term" as N character submission (col. 4 lines 36-41), Brotman et al

(5917889) teaches dynamic grammar usage (col. 4 lines 47-52), Brotman et al (5917889) teaches

a fixed number of input characters (col. 5 lines 25-30).

As per the arguments against claims 13,23, examiner argues that Brotman teaches limited

grammar size (as noted in the Office Action rejection); this is a concern of Brotman, as

reaffirmed by the passage in col. 5 lines 15-18.

As per the arguments against independent claim 24, examiner argues that Brotman

teaches partial queries, and the query based grammar, as presented in the Office Action, and the

rebuttal presented above with respect to claim 1.

As per the arguments against claim 25, examiner notes that Loghmani teaches HTML and other markup languages (col. 1 lines 20-23); an artisan of ordinary skill would easily recognize that VoiceXML would be included in this category.

As per the argument against claim 27, examiner notes that an obviousness type rejection was made with proper motivation to combine the references, not an informal reliance upon the Weber reference.

As per the arguments against claim 33, examiner disagrees and argues that Brotman's method performs a two step process wherein on the first pass, the user enters the query via telephone pad (that represents characters), and on the second pass, the user further delimits the query by speaking/uttering the characters (Brotman, Fig. 2).

As per the arguments against claim 43(44-49), examiner argues that Brotman teaches the analysis of an utterance (col. 7 lines 12-16).

As per the arguments against claim 47, examiner argues that the passage of Brotman shows "previously entered", i.e., matching the claim scope "previously generated grammars" (col. 4 lines 45-51).

Claims 50-54, and associated arguments, are similar in scope and content to the previously presented claims, and are rejected under similar rationale.

Furthermore, in response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Appellant has failed to

provide a direct compare/contrast between current claim scope and the combination of references as presented in the office action rejections.

### (11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael N Opsasnick

Primary Examiner, AU2626

Conferees:

Mr. Michael Opsasnick, Primary Examiner, AU2626

Mr. Richemond Dorvil, SPE, Speech Divison, AU2626

Mr. Patrick Edouard, SPE, Speech Division, AU2626

# SIRDEV MIS INTRANET

## APPEAL CENTER RETURN

Application Number: 09650173

Date: 28-Aug-2007

Examiner: MICHAEL, OPSASNICK

GAU: 2626

**Appeal Document(s) that caused this Return** -- *Please check at least one Document type:*

☑ Examiner's Answer

☐ Supplemental Examiner's Answer

☑ IDS

☐ Translation of foreign references needed

☐ Amendments not entered/considered

☐ Affidavits, Declarations, Evidence

☐ Artifacts

☐ Other

**Reason for Return** (from Appeal Specialist to Examiner) -- *Please check at least one Message box or enter text:*

☐ No Appeal Conference Held

☐ Conference initials needed (three)

☐ Headings

☐ New Ground of Rejection - TC Director signature needed

*corrected the patent #.*

*not req'd after patent # correction.*

(256 characters max)

```
In Grounds of Rej. reference Weber 6,532,444 is mentioned, please insert this
in the Evidence section. A PTOL-90 can be used to correct the request. Also,
IDS/1449 date 12/18/03 & 1/31/07 needs acknowledgement. Thanks, Bridget 2-1651
```

Print this Form      Send to Examiner

To go back use Back button on your browser toolbar.

Back to PALM | ASSIGNMENT | OASIS Home page